



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ancient Legends of Roman History. By ETTORE PAIS.
Translated by MARIO E. COSENZA. New York, Dodd,
Mead and Company, 1905. Pp. xiv, 336. \$4.00 net.

This book consists of a series of lectures written by Professor Pais for the Lowell Institute and several American universities. Among the subjects treated are "The Excavations in the Roman Forum", "The Origins of Rome", "Acca Larentia", "Tarpeia", "The Saxum Tarpeium", "The Legends of Servius Tullius", "The Legends of the Horatii and the Cult of Vulcan", "The Fabii at the River Cremera", "The Legends of Lucretia and of Virginia", and "The Topography of the Earliest Rome". In each case Pais endeavors to establish by a special and detailed demonstration the views which he has set forth more succinctly in his *Storia di Roma*. These are, he claims, "the logical conclusion of an objective and untiring examination of facts".

In his first chapter he sketches the development of the critical method from Lorenzo Valla through Beaufort and Niebuhr to Mommsen. To Beaufort he pays a special tribute. Niebuhr introduced greater precision of method, but the principles upon which he worked were in no respect sounder than those of the French scholar. While fully recognizing Mommsen's great contributions, Pais thinks that he erred in placing too much reliance upon the *Fasti* as a source for Roman constitutional history. He is of the opinion that a minute and careful examination of the political constitution makes it clear that there is in it the same impurity of sources that is generally acknowledged in the case of the narratives of external events. He holds that the official story of the Roman constitution was derived in great part from annalistic sources of the first century B. C., nor did these annalists possess monumental *Fasti* to which they could refer. The *Fasti Capitolini* do not represent the most ancient sources but are dependent upon recent works. They are to be classed with the *elogia* of the Augustan age. They are the result of the researches of scholars—men who begin with the generation of Varro, Cicero, and Cornelius Nepos. There is no reason for attributing greater value to them than to the records of triumphs. The majority of the Roman annalists were patriots. They were, too, genealogists and demagogues rather than true historians. They obscured the truth of the early national history with their countless and more or less deliberate falsifications.

With Pais' contention that early Roman history must be tested by a rigorously critical method no one will join issue. Much of

what he sets forth with such vehemence has been regarded as axiomatic for generations. It is, indeed, somewhat surprising that he should devote so much space to a plea for a method which every judicious reader would assume to be the only possible one. It would almost seem as if Professor Pais thought that the hysterical interpretation of the monuments recently uncovered in the Forum—which saw in them a confirmation of some of the stories of early Rome—had been widely and favorably received in this country. But while there will be no dissent from the principles of investigation laid down by Professor Pais, many readers will hesitate to accept some of the “demonstrations” that are offered in the treatment of the different legends. While quick to recognize the erudition, the ingenuity, the extraordinary swiftness of combination that some of the essays show, students of Roman history and Roman religion will, in numerous instances, be extremely doubtful whether the author’s results are securely based on that foundation of fact of which he himself speaks so often.

For example, in the second essay, on what seems to be wholly insufficient data he is inclined to think that the archaic stele in the Forum records the memory of sacred ceremonies performed in honor of Soranus. The most tangible piece of evidence which he adduces in favor of this theory is the occurrence of the fragmentary word *sora* in the inscription. Furthermore, basing his statement on the “explicit testimony of ancient texts” he adds that the god Soranus represented at the same time both the light and the darkness. As a parallel to this double function he adds that we “know” that Vulcanus represented the diurnal activity of the Sun, Summanus the nocturnal. What does the “explicit testimony” amount to? In Virgil, *Aen.* XI 785, in Plin. *N. H.* VII 19, and in some passages in Silius Italicus, Soranus is identified with Apollo; while in Servius’ note on the Virgilian passage he is identified with Dis pater. Servius probably had the true conception of the god, but the identification with Apollo is, as Wissowa has shown, almost certainly an error. Moreover, there is no evidence that Vulcanus was a sun god; and what little we know of Summanus does not point in that direction.

In discussing the age of the inscribed stele Pais shows a tendency to assign it to a later period than scholars generally have done. His position is that there is no proof that it is earlier than 387 B. C. (the Gallic fire), and he claims that there is nothing to exclude the possibility of its having been inscribed in the years immediately following that catastrophe. He argues that the external form of the stele, the vertical boustrophedon direction of the writing, the diacritic marks, and the archaic forms of the letters are by no means final evidence of a great antiquity. For the direction of the writing he cites parallels from *Magna Graecia* and from *Venetia*, which he puts as late as the third century B. C. The archaic lettering is compared with that on many monuments

of Picenum, of the Marrucini, of the Paeligni, the Marsi, and the Veneti. Even the closed Ξ , perhaps the most archaic form on the stele, appears on the Etruscan tegula, which Pais thinks may be as late as the third century. The muster of evidence is indeed, from some points of view, a remarkable one, and Professor Pais gives abundant proofs of the range of his erudition. But his argument is not convincing. In some cases he does not establish clearly the date of those monuments with which he compares the stele. Moreover, archaic forms and other characteristics of antiquity would naturally linger longer in the more remote parts of Italy than in Rome. The provincial inscriptions are not a fair criterion. It is hardly likely that an inscription in Rome, showing such an aggregation of archaic characteristics, could be later than the fifth century. That the monument rests upon a stratum later than that representing the era of the Gallic fire (see Studniczka, *Jahreshefte d. oesterr. Arch. Instituts* VI 146 ff.), does not seriously decrease the probability of this date. It was probably replaced upon the new level after the fire.

In his chapter on the origin of Rome, Pais offers a new derivation of the name of the city. Basing his conjecture partly on the prominent place given to the *figus Ruminalis* in the recently discovered Pompeian fresco, and partly on other data, he suggests that the name Roma was derived from the *figus Ruminalis*. The tree in turn (*caprificus*, fig-tree) was called *Ruminalis* from the nursing breast, *rumis* (from which milk flows), because a milky juice flows from its fruit. Enlarging upon this theme he points out the conspicuous place given to the *figus Ruminalis* in early legends, e. g. its transfer to the Comitium when the Forum Romanum became the centre of the enlarged city. That the early Romans should have named their city from the fig-tree, which so many peoples regarded as the emblem of fruitfulness, Pais thinks quite natural. He compares *Ficana* and *Ficulea*, and adds examples of cities, the names of which were derived from other trees. In all this we see that ingenuity and cleverness which is so marked a characteristic of Pais' work, but his arguments are far from being conclusive. His theory does not rank higher than an etymological possibility. His identification of the tree in the fresco as the *figus Ruminalis* is reasonably certain, but he seems to emphasize unduly its importance as an element in the picture. Moreover, its transfer to the Comitium is satisfactorily accounted for by the fact of its sacred associations, which of course no one disputes. The parallels which Professor Pais draws from the names of American cities derived from trees (e. g. *Oakland*, *Red Oak*, and *Cypress City*) are not to be taken seriously.

In his treatment of *Acca Larentia*, Pais endeavors to prove that *Acca Larentia* is simply the mother of the *Lares*. The difference of quantity in *Lāres* and *Lārentia* does not, he thinks, constitute a serious objection to this theory. Both Mommsen and Wissowa seem to him to have failed to understand the fundamental char-

acter of the divinity. He draws attention to certain points of contact between the cult of Larentia and that of Angerona, of Dia, of Bona Dea, and of Flora, and finally reaches the conclusion that Larentia was identical with Bona Dea. But Professor Pais has failed to establish either that Larentia was the mother of the Lares, or that she and Bona Dea were identical. The former of these two theories is, it will be remembered, a very old one. It has been asserted and denied again and again. A detailed argument in favor of it is to be found in De Marchi's *Culto Privato*; while Wissowa has declared against it. Pais, like the earlier advocates of the theory, appeals to the account of Lara, Larunda, Tacita, and Muta, given by Ovid in his *Fasti*. That our author, with his ideals of historical criticism, should place such credence in a poet's fancies cannot fail to be a matter for surprise. Nor are there sufficient reasons for his assumption that the Lares are deities of a sepulchral character. The ultimate significance of the cult of the Lares is still a debatable question. The trend of the saner criticism, however, is away from the theory that they were sepulchral divinities. Furthermore, his identification of Acca Larentia and Bona Dea has not a sound basis. He himself (p. 67) recognizes that he is on dangerous ground here. The wholesale identification of similar or allied cults was one of the besetting sins of the ancient critics and has introduced untold confusion into the history of Roman religion. Pais seems to fall into the same error.

The chapter (V) on Tarpeia begins with a summary of the different versions of the legend—those found in Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, Calpurnius Piso, Propertius, and other authors. A skilful analysis brings out the elements common to them all; and the citation of more than one Greek legend of the same general character (e. g. the story of the Naxian Polycrita and that of the Lesbian Peisidike) leads to the conclusion that in the myth of Tarpeia we are dealing with one of the many Hellenic legends localized on Roman soil by the Greeks who first narrated the history of the Latin city. Professor Pais does not of course set this forth as a new theory. The influence of Greek legends upon the story has long been recognized. A detailed investigation of the subject has recently been published by Sanders in the University of Michigan Studies, 1905, pp. 1-47. So far as the ultimate source of the legend is concerned, Pais' view is, in all probability, the correct one, but the same cannot be said of his explanation of the local elements in it. His statement is "Tarpeia was originally a beneficent deity . . . she is the personification of the Mons Tarpeius which was called Capitolinus only after the erection by the Tarquins of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. In truth the words Tarpeius and Tarquinius are but two forms of the same word" (p. 105). Even if the etymology were correct, there would be no evidence here that Tarpeia was ever regarded as the tutelary divinity of the hill. Certainly the references to the

Vestal Tarpeia do not lead to this conclusion. The explanation offered by Sanders is more probable, namely, that the rock was named from the gens Tarpeia who lived upon it; that the Vestal Tarpeia, who appears in some of the versions, was a member of this family, and was buried in that vicinity; and that it was the proximity of her tomb to the place identified with the execution of those who had been guilty of treason which resulted in her being transformed into the traitor of the legend.

In Chap. VI Pais reopens the old question of the site of the Saxum Tarpeium. He places it on the northern part of the hill, where the Arx and the temple of Juno Moneta were. His arguments, however, have not the weight of those advanced by Jordan, Gilbert, Richter, and Huelsen in favor of the southern site.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is that dealing with Servius Tullius. Professor Pais' analysis shows clearly the legendary character of the various achievements attributed to that king. For example it was said that he had abolished the nexum; but it is probable that this was not done away with till the end of the fourth century B. C. It was Servius Tullius who was supposed to have divided the city into four urban tribes; but it was only in 304 B. C. that these four tribes were formed. Legend said that Servius laid the foundations of the temple of Diana Aventinensis with the purpose of compelling the Latins to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome; but such supremacy was not attained till a far later period. It is likewise stated that Servius Tullius, after the conquest of the Etruscans, erected a temple to Fortuna on the right bank of the Tiber and a second one to Mater Matuta in the Forum Boarium; it is probable, however, that the latter was erected only in the time of Furius Camillus, and the former by the consul Carvilius. Further, there is no evidence that Servius Tullius was the first to coin money. Nor does the Servian wall belong to the time at which he was supposed to have lived. It is a structure of the fourth century B. C. Pais is at his best in this part of the essay. But when he comes to his explanation of the origin of the legend he is not so successful. By a series of daring and in many cases manifestly improbable combinations and parallels he attempts to show that Servius Tullius, associated as he was with the cult of Diana Aventinensis, was identical with the *servus* rex of the cult of Diana at Lake Nemi.

The treatment of the other legends cannot be discussed in detail. The myths of Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola are traced to the influence of local monuments. The analysis of the story of the three hundred and six Fabii—a composite of Greek legend, Roman history, and Latin topography—is one of the most satisfactory in the book.

The typography of the book is reasonably good. I have noticed only the following misprints: *memorensis* (p. 144),

cenception (p. 58), Compilalicia (p. 66), Ambarvalio (p. 65). On p. 58 Palilia occurs; elsewhere the better attested form of the word (Parilia) is used. The general appearance of the page would have been improved if the paragraphs had been a little more deeply indented. The illustrations, on the mechanical side, are good. Their purpose, however, seems to be decorative rather than illustrative.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

G. J. LAING.

Anecdota Oxoniensia: Classical Series. Part X. The Vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio. By A. C. CLARK. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1905.

Clark's new volume in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* is concerned with a Cluni MS of Cicero's orations, and makes a still more valuable contribution, if possible, than its predecessor did, to the study of the text of Cicero. The *Vetus Cluniacensis* contained the orations pro Milone, pro Caelio, pro Cluentio, pro Roscio, and pro Murena, and is the archetype of all existing copies of the Rosciana and Mureniana. Consequently its importance can hardly be overestimated, yet strangely enough it has hitherto received very scant attention. As Clark concisely puts it, for Cicero's speeches "the MSS have been not weighed but numbered."

In this paper he addresses himself to the task of tracing the history, so far as it can be followed, of the lost *Cluniacensis*, and of determining the relations which its descendants bear to it and to one another. By a clever bit of reasoning he identifies it with no. 496 in the twelfth-century catalogue of Cluni, in which catalogue, it will be remembered, Peterson's *Holkham MS* was set down as no. 498. Clark's Cluni MS antedates the Caroline reform in spelling, and cannot, therefore, be later than the end of the eighth century. From it we have a French and an Italian tradition. The French tradition is best represented by Σ (= Lat. 14.749) in the Paris library. This MS gives us in full from the *Cluniacensis* the speeches pro Murena and pro Sex. Roscio and marginalia to the pro Milone, pro Caelio, and pro Cluentio. From Σ are derived Par. 6369, Par. 7777, and *Wolfenbüttel*. 205. One of the best representatives of the Italian tradition is Laur. LIV. 5, which contains excerpts made from the Cluni MS by Bartolommeo da Montepulciano, the friend of its discoverer, Poggio. It was the identification of these excerpts in the Laurentian library which gave Clark his first important clue in establishing the relations which the existing representatives of *Cluniacensis* bear to one another. The connection of certain other Italian MSS with Poggio's is also clearly determined, although Clark was unable to find the copy which Poggio caused to be